Attachment to Independent Case Review Report
For CDRU # 7378 Case file # 95-232302.

Material Examiner: Malone (RO)

Remarks:

Case resulted in trial. Transcript not provided.

CRM - 7382

INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: Steve Robertson

Area(s) of Expertise: Hair and Fiber

Review commenced at: 9:45 AM (Time), 03/16/2001 (Date)

File #: 95-232302

Laboratory #(s): 90723032

Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
RQ	X☐	☐		☐	☐
TI, UF, RB	☐	☐		☐	☐
	☐	☐		☐	☐

Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of:

Testimony Date(s): Pages:

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number: 90723032 Date: Aug 22, 1979

Laboratory Number: Date:

Laboratory Number: Date:

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ

Laboratory Number: 90723032

Initials: SM

CRM - 7383

Was any other material reviewed? X☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: Submitting agency letter (dated 7-7-79)

Results of Review

File #: 95-232302 Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q10, Q18

Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)?
☐ Yes X☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes? ☐ Yes X ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Review of Testimony:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

X☐ Transcript not available.

3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Initials: SWC

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95-232302

#1: From the documentation, it appears that an attempt to physically match the torn pieces of fabric to the torn areas of the victim's jacket was not performed. It a physical match had been demonstrated, it would conclusively prove the torn pieces of fabric came from the victim's jacket. The analysis performed demonstrates the pieces of fabric are similar to the jacket and could have come from the jacket.

#2: The examination results set forth in the laboratory report are supported by the bench notes, but the documentation is marginally adequate. The notes are not dated or initialed and are in pencil. It appears the technician identified the type of fibers in the evidence (polyester, cotton, rayon) but there is no documentation of the tests performed to accomplish that. There is no documentation that attempts to obtain a physical match was done or an explanation of why it was not done.

Review completed at: 10:15 AM (Time), 03/16/2001 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0:45 hours

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 4 pages.

Ann Roberts — 03/16/2001

(Signature) (Date)

Initials: SWL

Additional Comments
(Set forth by question #, if applicable)

File #: 95-232302

#2 (continued):

The reported results state the blue fabric is like the blue fabric of the jacket "in all observable characteristics" and the white fabric is like the interfacing used in the jacket "in all observable characteristics". This is a vague term. It would have been better to state what those characteristics are, such as color, composition, construction and design (which Malone indicates in his bench notes).

Initials: SM